United Nations

FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.6

Framework Convention on Climate Change

Distr.: General
29 May 2015

English only

Subsidiary Body for Implementation
Forty-second session
Bonn, 1–11 June 2015

Item 7 of the provisional agenda
National adaptation plans

Report on the workshop on experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans

Note by the secretariat

Summary

This is a report on the workshop organized by the Adaptation Committee in collaboration with the Least Developed Countries Expert Group in Bonn, Germany, on 16 and 17 April 2015. The workshop involved experts and practitioners at different levels who shared experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in relation to the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans (NAPs). The report includes a summary of the options for enhancing reporting related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs as discussed at the workshop. It also summarizes issues for further consideration by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation.

GE.15-10891 (E)

1510891

Please recycle

Contents

		Paragraphs	Page
I.	Introduction	1–6	3
	A. Background and mandate	1–4	3
	B. Scope of the document	5	3
	C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation	6	3
II.	Proceedings	7–12	4
III.	Experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans	13–46	5
	A. Experiences with the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans	15–34	5
	B. Good practices and lessons learned in the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans	35–42	8
	C. Gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans	43–46	10
IV.	Options for enhancing reporting related to the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans	47–63	12
	A. Existing reporting channels	49–55	12
	B. Options for enhancing reporting related to the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans	56–63	14
Annex			
	Guiding questions		16

I. Introduction

A. Background and mandate

1. The Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), at its fortieth session, invited the Adaptation Committee (AC), in collaboration with the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG), to organize a workshop, back to back with a relevant workshop where possible, drawing on experts and practitioners at different levels to share experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans (NAPs), to be held prior to SBI 42 [1]

2. As further input for the monitoring and evaluation of the NAP process by the SBI and for the workshop mentioned in paragraph 1 above, the SBI had invited the LEG and the AC to prepare an information paper[2] on experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement NAPs based on the NAP Expo and relevant documents, including the submissions referred to in document FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraphs 93, 103 and 104, for consideration at SBI 41.[3]

3. Furthermore, the Conference of the Parties (COP), at its twentieth session, decided to explore options for enhancing reporting related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs as part of the workshop referred to in paragraph 1 above.[4]

4. The SBI invited the AC, in collaboration with the LEG and with the support of the secretariat, to prepare a report on the above-mentioned workshop. The SBI will consider the report, together with other documents, as it monitors and evaluates progress made in the NAP process, with a view to making recommendations to the COP, as appropriate.[5]

B. Scope of the document

5. This report on the workshop referred to in chapter I.A above draws on the presentations made and discussions held at the workshop. It first describes the proceedings and the approach to the organization of the workshop, and then provides a summary of the key topics raised during discussions and of issues for further consideration by the SBI.

C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

6. SBI 42 may wish to consider this report as it monitors and evaluates progress made in the NAP process, with a view to making recommendations to the COP, including the following, as appropriate:[6] a recommendation that the COP request or provide guidance to the AC, the LEG, other constituted bodies under the Convention, operating entities of the Financial Mechanism and relevant organizations on addressing the gaps and needs identified in this report and document FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.14; and a recommendation to the COP on how reporting channels could be enhanced to fulfil any reporting needs for the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

---

[1] FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraph 106.
[2] Available as document FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.14.
[3] FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraph 107.
[4] Decision 3/CP.20, paragraph 8.
[5] FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraph 108.
[6] See decision 3/CP.20 and document FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraphs 106 and 108.

II. Proceedings

7. The workshop was held in Bonn, Germany, on 16 and 17 April 2015. It was chaired by a Co-Chair of the AC, Mr. Juan Pablo Hoffmaister. Thematic sessions were facilitated by Mr. Batu Uprety, Chair of the LEG, Mr. Thinley Namgyel, member of the LEG, and Ms. Margaret Mukahanana Sangarwe, member of the AC.

8. The workshop was attended by 86 participants, including representatives of Parties, constituted bodies under the Convention (including the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention and the Standing Committee on Finance), the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat, the Global Environment Facility secretariat and its Independent Evaluation Office, as well as of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) secretariat. Also in attendance were various representatives of United Nations organizations and specialized agencies, bilateral and multilateral agencies, international, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and regional centres and networks.

9. Participants were requested to build on the findings contained in document FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.14 (see para. 2 above) by expanding them or adding more specific details. Participants were guided by questions elaborated by the AC and the LEG prior to the workshop and contained in the annex. The guiding questions were shared with all participants in advance of the workshop and were made available on the workshop web page.[7]

10. The AC and the LEG made presentations to frame the workshop and highlight relevant developments and/or information from recent events. The AC highlighted key messages from its work, including from a workshop on monitoring and evaluation held in September 2013,[8] a meeting with United Nations agencies, multilateral and bilateral intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations supporting the NAP process held in September 2014,[9] and a workshop on means of implementation for enhanced adaptation action held in March 2015.[10] The LEG provided highlights on its work on the process to formulate and implement NAPs, including on the technical guidelines,[11] NAP Central[12] and training. It also highlighted the key outcomes of NAP Expo 2015.[13]

11. Discussion on the first day of the workshop focused on experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement NAPs. The second day was devoted to options for enhancing reporting related to that process. After two general sessions introducing the workshop and providing an overview of medium- and long-term adaptation issues, the two main topics of the workshop were taken up as follows: an overview presentation in plenary was followed by targeted discussions in breakout groups. Rapporteurs of each breakout group then reported back on the group's main findings to the plenary, where these findings were further discussed. Breakout groups on day one discussed the topics of governance structures, policies, regulations and legislation; science and knowledge; finance and implementation; and monitoring, evaluation, reporting, sharing and learning. The two breakout groups of day two discussed reporting related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs and the national and international levels of such reporting, respectively.

[7] <unfccc.int/8903>.
[8] See <http://unfccc.int/7744>.
[9] See <http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/20140927r.pdf>.
[10] See <http://unfccc.int/8860>.
[11] See <http://unfccc.int/7279>.
[12] See <www4.unfccc.int/nap>.
[13] See <http://unfccc.int/8887>.

12. At the end of the workshop, the chair presented an overall summary of the findings on the two main topics of the workshop: experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement NAPs; and options for enhancing reporting related to that process.

III. Experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans

13. In line with the design of the workshop, and building on relevant information from document FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.14, the discussion on experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement NAPs was structured around selected topics related to each of the four elements of the NAP process shown in the table.

Topics discussed at the workshop

Element of the national adaptation plan process	*Selected topics under the elements*
Element A: laying the groundwork and addressing gaps	Governance structures, policies, regulations and legislation
Element B: preparatory elements	Science and knowledge
Element C: implementation strategies	Finance and implementation
Element D: reporting, monitoring and review	Monitoring, evaluation, reporting, sharing and learning

Note: Information on the elements of the NAP process can be found in the annex to decision 5/CP.17 and in the technical guidelines for the NAP process, available at <unfccc.int/7279>.

14. The information related to governance structures, policies, regulations and legislation, and on science and knowledge was based on practical experiences with the process to formulate and implement NAPs shared by the countries. For the sections on finance and implementation, and on monitoring, evaluation, reporting, sharing and learning the information presented was based on experiences of countries with activities that could inform the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

A. Experiences with the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans

15. Regarding governance structures, many participants indicated that their countries have in place various national institutional arrangements related to climate change adaptation. Some countries are using the existing institutional arrangements to execute the process to formulate and implement NAPs, while others are enhancing the existing and/or establishing new institutional arrangements. For many of the countries, the institutional arrangements include the following three main categories:

(a) National climate change agency or department: situated in one ministry with a focal point network of representatives from other ministries, tasked with coordinating development and implementation of sector strategies and plans and the integration of climate change adaptation into development planning processes;

(b) Multidisciplinary technical group, team or committee: composed of representatives of various agencies and institutions at the national level (usually technical experts from national ministries, local authorities, civil society, academia and research). The group, team or committee facilitates cooperation among the different agencies and institutions and coordinates the development of national strategies, frameworks and/or plans;

(c) National climate change committee: composed of senior policymakers and representatives of non-governmental entities; advises the government on the vision and strategy for addressing climate change adaptation at the national level, and provides overall coordination and monitoring of the national climate change adaptation policies, plans and programmes.

16. As to the policies, regulations and legislation, most of the participants mentioned that they have national climate change policies, frameworks, and/or strategies that define national goals, strategy and the role of the government and other actors with respect to climate change adaptation. Some participants further indicated that their countries have enacted legislation on climate change, while others said that they are working towards enacting new or revising existing legislation. Some participants mentioned the plans for the creation of a specific national mandate for the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

17. Regarding the initiation and/or launch of the process to formulate and implement NAPs, certain participants indicated that this was done through a national workshop involving a diversity of stakeholders, held to mark the official launch of the NAP process. The workshops were used to raise awareness among stakeholders at the national level, emphasize the importance of the process to formulate and implement NAPs and mobilize support.

18. Many participants indicated that their countries have integrated climate change adaptation into their national development frameworks. The frameworks contain specific objectives relating to nationwide actions on climate change adaptation, and have been used to mobilize and engage a wide range of stakeholders at the national level. Other participants highlighted plans to enhance the integration of adaptation into national, subnational and local development frameworks.

19. Participants also shared information on the application of the NAP guidelines to the design of their national processes. A variety of approaches were highlighted on how the guidelines were used:

(a) In cases where comprehensive adaptation planning and implementation processes had been already in place at the national level before the NAP guidelines were issued, the guidelines were used as a reference point in examining the ongoing processes and to prepare additional elements. In such cases it was found that the principles used to guide national activities on adaptation were consistent with the NAP guidelines, and that some of the sample outputs identified in the NAP guidelines had been already partly achieved, though not in the systematic manner recommended in the guidelines;

(b) In cases where countries embarked on comprehensive work on adaptation after the NAP guidelines had been put in place, the guidelines were being used as the basis.

20. On science and knowledge, most participants indicated that their countries have undertaken various assessments of climate change impacts, vulnerabilities and risks, as well as of adaptation options and past or current adaptation activities. In the case of developing countries, such activities include the submission of national communications to the secretariat, the preparation of national adaptation programmes of action (in the case of least developed countries (LDCs)), and a diversity of multilateral and bilateral programmes

and/or projects, including the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience,[14] the Global Climate Change Alliance,[15] the joint national action plans on climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction,[16] the Caribbean Regional Framework for Achieving Development Resilient to Climate[17] and the Africa Adaptation Programme.[18]

21. In the case of developed countries, the assessments were part of planned activities to inform adaptation planning and implementation at the national level.

22. Participants mentioned that the experiences gained in undertaking the assessments will assist them in conducting more comprehensive and rigorous future assessments under the NAP process. For some, the assessments undertaken can already adequately inform the NAP process.

23. In addition, participants mentioned that there have been capacity-building efforts to support the assessments, including the establishment of national climate service centres, provision of advice to local planners on climate data and information, and training.

24. Some participants indicated that their countries have NAPs in place; some stated that their countries are in advanced stages of formulating their NAPs. Some of the participants also elaborated on further plans to develop sector-specific adaptation plans. The following approaches applied to or being considered for the formulation of NAPs can be extracted from the examples provided:

(a) Development of sectoral plans for the most vulnerable and/or key sectors, including in cases where such plans were afterwards aggregated into a national plan;

(b) Development of a national plan from the elements of sector-specific plans. An integrating framework guides the feeding of sector plans into the overall NAP.

25. Many participants also mentioned elements that could be potentially included in a NAP. These were, in no particular order and not necessarily mutually exclusive:

(a) A national framework, including goals, role of government and other stakeholders, scope and focus areas;

(b) A national strategy on climate change adaptation;

(c) Results of the assessments of impacts, vulnerability and adaptation;

(d) Plans for monitoring and review;

(e) Cross-cutting issues such as collaboration, synergies, research and outreach.

26. Regarding finance and implementation, participants shared their experiences on the implementation of adaptation actions under a variety of initiatives and on accessing finance from a variety of sources.

27. In reference to the design of implementation strategies, participants mentioned that countries would identify financing requirements for the different adaptation options at the national level and then develop a strategy to guide the implementation process. That strategy would include priority sectors/themes for adaptation actions, prioritized adaptation actions, costs, financing and key actors, as well as monitoring and evaluation components.

---

[14] See <www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/Pilot_Program_for_Climate_Resilience>.

[15] See <www.gcca.eu>.

[16] See <www.sprep.org/Adaptation/current-programmes>.

[17] See <http://dms.caribbeanclimate.bz/M-Files/openfile.aspx?objtype=0&docid=948>. See <http://www.caribbeanclimate.bz/ongoing-projects/2009-2021-regional-planning-for-climate-compatible-development-in-the-region.html> for further information on the implementation of the framework.

[18] See <www.undp-aap.org>.

28. It was pointed out that high-level decisions would help to prioritize the strengthening of the governance of climate change and the institutional arrangements for accessing domestic and external finance.

29. Some participants provided examples of national climate change trust funds established to mobilize and coordinate funding for the implementation of adaptation actions at the national level. These funds are administered through a designated national agency and support national institutions and the civil society.

30. Participants underlined the growing importance of viewing readiness to access adaptation finance as an incremental process that involves helping to strengthen the capacity of developing countries to receive and utilize climate financing as they adapt and build resilience to climate change. They emphasized that countries have by now demonstrated that they are ready to access several types and levels of funding, and that they should thus be provided with the opportunity to start the process and learn by doing. In this context, some participants referred to regional programmes and their role in improving the capacity of countries to access adaptation finance.

31. On the issue of reporting and monitoring, participants shared experiences with the establishment of indicators for describing measurable impacts of climate change and the effect of the implemented measures in selected areas of action. The indicators would be used to guide reporting of progress on addressing the impacts of climate change.

32. Some participants indicated that their countries have established or are considering conducting reviews of national plans at four- or five-year intervals. This would allow them to take into account, among other inputs, the latest assessments of climate change impacts, vulnerabilities and risks, and the latest priorities and lessons learned. Other participants stated that the review interval could be linked to the frequency of the publication of assessment reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

33. As for sharing of information, some participants indicated that mechanisms have been established at the national levels to facilitate collaboration among different levels of government, public and private sector actors. The mechanisms facilitate sectoral and regional work on the basis of shared priorities and resources.

34. Several participants also referred to the potential of regional centres to provide opportunities for sharing experiences and facilitating learning.

B. Good practices and lessons learned in the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans

35. One possible structure participants referred to in reference to governance structures, policies, regulations and legislation was the establishment of interministerial coordination mechanisms. Examples of benefits such mechanisms may entail include the following:

(a) Having one body coordinate national climate change policy facilitates the integration of adaptation into other sectors;

(b) Establishing a streamlined and rationalized body that deals with both climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction saves resources and enables holistic decision-making;

(c) Such a set-up encourages full government support and addresses overlaps.

36. Furthermore, some participants shared the following considerations:

(a) It is important to ensure the involvement of all stakeholders from different levels of decision-making such as local communities, and local and central governments;

(b) Coordination across different social groups and regional levels and across vertical structures of governance encourages multi-stakeholder involvement in the process and coordination across local, subnational and national levels;

(c) Increased awareness of climate change adaptation achieved through, for example, regional and/or international climate change events encourages participation of senior policymakers and of a wide range of stakeholders at the national level. This in turn generates high levels of support for adaptation from policymakers.

37. Regarding science and knowledge, participants highlighted that the NAP process presents opportunities for national governments to establish longer-term approaches to widely engaging the scientific community in informing adaptation planning and implementation.

38. Participants also highlighted that it is critical to ensure that all the stakeholders clearly understand their roles in the development of adaptation plans, that their capacity to carry them out is adequately developed and that the needed resources are made available.

39. It was also mentioned that regional centres and networks can play an important role in increasing a country's capacity to access finance for the process to formulate and implement NAPs. A number of regional centres are applying or have previously applied for accreditation as implementing entities of the GCF. Considering their long-time experience in supporting countries in their regions, they are well positioned to effectively support countries in accessing funding.

40. Participants flagged issues related to monitoring, evaluation, reporting, sharing and learning that could inform the design of effective systems for those activities. Firstly, it is important to be clear on what information needs to be monitored and why and how often it should be monitored. Secondly, a robust monitoring and evaluation system starts with an adaptation plan that makes it clear what needs to be monitored and what indicators and levels should be used.

41. Participants also indicated that the collection and monitoring of information must ideally start well before any adaptation effort so as to have a comparison baseline. They further recommended evaluating knowledge frequently in order to facilitate sharing and learning.

42. Participants highlighted the following lessons regarding monitoring and evaluation:

(a) Monitoring and evaluation systems need to be designed with a long-term perspective in mind and be refined as common understanding develops;

(b) Standardization of monitoring and evaluation can be beneficial, but only within each individual country;

(c) There is no right way to decide what to monitor and report and how to design the system. The correct method depends on where a country is in the process, the existing reporting procedures, the purposes for which the monitoring and reporting results will be used, and on existing capacities and resources;

(d) National buy-in and leadership in the monitoring and evaluation process is key for enabling the institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation of adaptation;

(e) Some information such as financial records may not be easy to obtain from certain national institutions owing to its nature;

(f) Gaps and needs can be addressed by decision makers and society in general by making incremental improvements in knowledge and awareness.

C. Gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans

43. With respect to governance structure, policies, regulations and legislation, participants identified the following gaps and needs:

(a) It is important to put in place an appropriate mandate that defines, inter alia, the lead agency, the responsibilities of various national agencies and the operationalization of the national policy framework;

(b) There is low awareness of countries regarding NAP guidelines; strategies and structures are required to promote their use;

(c) There is a need to generate a deeper understanding of the process to formulate and implement NAPs at the national and international levels;

(d) Challenges exist in understanding or following various guidance documents related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs, including in relation to support, in particular for some of the countries whose working language is not English;

(e) It is importance to set up information systems or databases to manage all the information related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

44. Participants identified the following gaps and needs with regard to science and knowledge:

(a) It is important that the process to formulate and implement NAPs takes an interdisciplinary, scientific approach to informing policy and solutions and setting priorities and that they take traditional knowledge into account;

(b) A national-level dialogue between the research community and policymakers is necessary to support the formulation of NAPs;

(c) Local knowledge should be considered when undertaking assessments;

(d) It is important to consider the potential impact of regional issues, such as cross-border issues and related agreements, and international issues, such as global agreements on climate change, sustainable development goals, etc., on decision-making at the national level;

(e) It is the responsibility of the science community to focus not just on the problem, but also on solutions. It is the responsibility of the policy community to employ science in the search for solutions;

(f) Filling data gaps is important, but in the meantime making decisions under uncertainty, along with focusing on implementation, remains necessary;

(g) Training national/sector experts to conduct activities such as vulnerability assessments, scenario-building and development of frameworks for accessing funding for support for the process;

(h) More information is needed from the research community for informed, evidence-based plans and future reviews and updates.

45. On finance and implementation, participants identified the following gaps and needs:

(a) Developing longer-term, strategic frameworks for implementation that identify national adaptation priorities and sources of funding that match the planned adaptation actions;

(b) Clarifying the procedures and requirements for accessing different sources of funds early enough in the process in order to facilitate the harmonization of countries' strategies with the potential sources of funding;

(c) Considering both external (multilateral and bilateral) and domestic sources of funding for climate change adaptation in order to expand the pool of resources;

(d) Developing national climate change adaptation financing frameworks, through which all relevant stakeholders would report on funding received;

(e) Finding ways to expedite the provision of funding to developing countries for the formulation of NAPs. Participants noted that both the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund had run out of funds and that either additional funds should be contributed to them or other options for developing countries to access funding for the formulation of NAPs need to be pursued;

(f) The GCF should work closely with the AC and the LEG in facilitating developing countries' access to funding from the GCF for the process to formulate and implement NAPs;

(g) The readiness and preparatory support provided through the GCF needs to also focus on supporting countries in their process to formulate and implement NAPs;

(h) Bilateral institutions need to develop financing strategies together with the governments;

(i) A collaboration platform for bringing together developing countries and financial partners would be helpful. Multilateral and bilateral partners should work in very close collaboration with the governments to ensure country ownership. Countries also need to determine where the overlaps are and what processes are burdensome.

46. Regarding monitoring, evaluation, reporting, sharing and learning, participants identified gaps and needs in relation to the following:

(a) Necessary tools and guidelines for designing and undertaking work on monitoring and evaluation;

(b) Technical support for a regular evaluation of information and knowledge and assessment of progress, effectiveness and gaps, including of the monitoring and evaluation systems;

(c) Ways to address the challenges stemming from monitoring and evaluation systems from different actors (e.g. national systems, donor-driven systems, etc.) having different standards and reporting requirements. Participants mentioned that different entities having different reporting standards makes it hard to lower the reporting burden;

(d) A learning platform to promote the sharing of experiences and learning, especially at the regional level;

(e) Allocation of relevant financial resources to the different phases and/or components of monitoring and evaluation.

IV. Options for enhancing reporting related to the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans

47. The discussion on reporting related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs started with a summary of the following relevant mandates:[19]

(a) An invitation to Parties to provide information through their national communications on what measures they have undertaken and on support provided or received relevant to the NAP process;

(b) An encouragement to LDC Parties, to the extent possible, to provide information on their NAP process through their national communications as well as other channels;

(c) A request to the LEG, the AC and other relevant Convention bodies to include information in their reports on how they responded to the request made in decision 5/CP.17 and on their activities relevant to the NAP process;

(d) An invitation to United Nations organizations, multilateral, intergovernmental and other international and regional organizations to provide information on their activities to support the NAP process;

(e) A request to the secretariat to collect, compile and synthesize information needed by the SBI to monitor and evaluate the progress made on the NAP process;

(f) Invitation to LDC Parties, and other interested developing country Parties that are not LDCs, that may wish to do so to forward outputs including NAP documents and outcomes related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs to NAP Central.

48. The discussion then focused on existing reporting channels and the options for enhancing reporting related to the process for formulate and implement NAPs at the international level, as well as communication and outreach at the national level.

A. Existing reporting channels

49. Participants considered the following existing reporting channels under the Convention:

(a) National communications: submitted by all Parties to communicate to the COP information relevant to the implementation of the Convention.[20] Developing countries submit national communications every four years, with flexibility for LDCs and small island developing States;[21]

(b) Biennial update reports: submitted by developing countries and containing updates on national greenhouse gas inventories, including a national inventory report and information on mitigation actions, needs and support received.[22] The reports are submitted every two years with flexibility for LDCs and small island developing States;[23]

(c) Biennial reports: submitted by developed countries to communicate progress in achieving quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets, and report on projected

[19] See decision 5/CP.17, paragraphs 32–38, and decision 3/CP.20, paragraph 9, for the complete text of the mandates.

[20] See Article 12 of the Convention.

[21] See <http://unfccc.int/1408>.

[22] Decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 60(c).

[23] See <http://unfccc.int/1408>.

emissions and the provision of financial, technology, and capacity-building support to developing country Parties.[24]

50. Furthermore, NAP Central was mentioned as one of the existing channels through which developing countries may respond to the invitation referred to in paragraph 47(f) above.

51. A few participants shared information on communication and outreach efforts related to adaptation activities at the national level. It was mentioned that through such efforts, countries communicate information on the progress, termination or renewal of specific projects and programmes, and provide reports on assessments of risks, vulnerabilities, impacts and adaptation. A further point was made that such national level communication is useful for facilitating learning on adaptation planning and implementation and accountability to various stakeholders.

52. Some participants indicated that current reporting systems for adaptation projects are biased towards the requirements of development/funding agencies. They suggested that reporting could be more inclusive and target other equally important sections such as the provision of information to the civil society, the private sector and the general public using appropriate means.

53. The following existing modalities for communication of climate change adaptation information at the national level and related outreach, which could also be considered when undertaking the process to formulate and implement NAPs, were highlighted by some of the participants:

(a) Policy briefs, posters and brochures for communicating major milestones or outputs on efforts to address climate change adaptation;

(b) Local electronic and print media (television, radio and newspapers);

(c) Websites of the lead agency on adaptation and of other key stakeholders, which can serve as a repository of national strategies and plans and reflect progress;

(d) Integration of information on latest findings on local effects of climate change implications into seasonal/climate forecast bulletins.

54. Participants further indicated some of the challenges regarding communication and outreach at the national level, including the following:

(a) In the case of projects and programmes, modalities are often driven by external partners and may not necessarily match national needs and formats;

(b) In some cases, the reporting format does not allow detailed technical inputs;

(c) Owing to a lack of coordination, reporting at times faces protocol challenges and delays in the submission of reports from other national agencies;

(d) National statistical entities in different sectors are not always willing to share their data for reasons such as confidentiality and security.

55. Participants also suggested the following potential solutions to the challenges referred to in paragraph 54 above:

(a) Putting in place mechanisms to ensure uniform channels of reporting, borrowing experience from other relevant national processes;

(b) Developing and harmonizing national knowledge management systems, which should incorporate information from performance monitoring frameworks;

[24] Decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 40(b) and (c).

(c) Providing simple and user-friendly formats for different data sets to be collected at the national level.

B. Options for enhancing reporting related to the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans

56. In discussing options for enhancing reporting related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs, participants concurred that it is important to first clearly identify the purpose and specific goals of such reporting. Many indicated that there is not yet sufficient clarity on the purpose and specific goals and on what exactly needs to be reported to the international community. Several participants noted that specifying goals and objectives would allow the determination of different reporting requirements.

57. With regard to such possible goals and objectives, participants explored that reporting could serve a variety of needs, including the sharing of knowledge and facilitation of learning, providing a better understanding of the gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement NAPs, communicating capacity-building needs, communicating achievements on reducing vulnerability to climate change, and matching needs with sources of support.

58. Subsequently, participants explored some of the possible elements that could be included in NAP documents and which could inform communication and outreach at the national level and/or reporting at the international level. These include:

(a) A national vision on adaptation;

(b) Policy frameworks including mandate for the process to formulate and implement NAPs;

(c) Assessments of impacts, vulnerabilities and risks;

(d) Adaptation priorities at the national and subnational levels;

(e) An overview of ongoing and planned adaptation actions;

(f) Communication and outreach strategies;

(g) Capacity gaps and needs;

(h) Required means of implementation (finance, technology and capacity-building) needed for the formulation and implementation of NAPs;

(i) Monitoring and evaluation frameworks.

59. Participants concurred that NAP documents prepared at the national level would serve as the primary source of information for, inter alia, national-level communication and outreach and reporting to the UNFCCC in accordance with decision 5/CP.17, paragraphs 32 and 33.

60. Regarding communication and outreach at the national level, participants agreed that there is a need to enhance efforts to share relevant outcomes and outputs of the process to formulate and implement NAPs with all national stakeholders. They mentioned that such efforts would need to remain flexible and apply commonly used approaches, including those from similar national processes, where applicable. In this regard, the participants highlighted the need to take into account the following considerations:

(a) Efforts need to be tailored to all relevant national stakeholder levels, from grass roots to policy;

(b) Efforts should be regular and could include information on outputs, outcomes, impacts, vulnerabilities and risks, as well as national adaptation capacity gaps and needs;

(c) There is a need to identify the target audience in order to ensure the application of appropriate modalities;

(d) Modalities for communication and outreach vary and can require significant resources. To minimize those requirements it might be helpful to consider existing mechanisms and structures and how they could be applied. Where possible, it might also be wise to develop centralized data collection and sharing systems;

(e) There is a need to strengthen efforts to generate political buy-in and general public awareness on adaptation at the national level. Presentation of information through a consolidated plan would help to enhance those efforts;

(f) Information produced and shared at the national level could form the basis for reporting to international processes such as the UNFCCC.

61. Regarding reporting to the UNFCCC, participants further elaborated that:

(a) National communications could communicate measures undertaken; progress, effectiveness and gaps in the process to formulate and implement NAPs and its overview; and support provided and received;

(b) Intended nationally determined contributions could capture information on the efforts made in relation to adaptation or components thereof;

(c) Either of the above-mentioned means of reporting could also be used to transmit NAP documents (e.g. by specifying where the documents have been published or can be accessed).

62. Participants then indicated that the guidelines for national communications may need to be revised to capture relevant information from the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

63. NAP Central was referred to in many instances as the platform through which developing countries will communicate information on NAPs. Participants elaborated that NAP Central would not only serve as a database of information on the process to formulate and implement NAPs, but also as a universal information system for access to NAP documents, relevant outputs and outcomes of that process, progress made by developing countries, gaps and needs, and support provided and received. They also agreed that providing information through NAP Central should not replace reporting through national communications or other channels.

Anne

Guiding questions

1. The following questions were meant to guide the organization of the workshop this document reports on, including: (a) as part of the invitation letters sent to the participants to assist them in preparing for the workshop; (b) to solicit inputs from the participants in advance of the workshop; and (c) to assist the organizers in designing the workshop programme. Participants were requested to provide information on their country on the basis of the guiding questions, which was compiled and made available at the workshop. The guiding questions were as follows:

2. On the focus area of sharing experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement NAPs, and in the context of governance structures; policies, regulations and legislation; stakeholder engagement, capacity development; science and knowledge; finance and implementation; and monitoring, evaluation, reporting, sharing and learning:

(a) What has your country done at the national level with regard to adaptation planning and implementation? How was it done?

(b) Which key choices were made and what were the main considerations?

(c) How has your country applied the NAP guidelines developed by the UNFCCC for NAPs (see <unfccc.int/7279>)? What gaps remain?

(d) How is your country coordinating support and available resources in the context of country ownership and country drivenness?

(e) What systems does your country have in place to identify and address gaps for adaptation planning and implementation?

3. On the focus area of exploring options for enhancing reporting related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs:

(a) What needs to be enhanced for reporting?

(b) What needs to be reported at the national and international levels?

(c) Do the existing modalities for reporting work? What constraints exist and how can they be overcome?

(d) How can existing modalities be improved to enhance reporting on the process to formulate and implement NAPs?

(e) What measures does your country have in place, or anticipate, to communicate the process to formulate and implement NAPs to stakeholders at the national level and beyond?